REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In response to the Examiner's drawing objections, proposed drawing amendments are shown in red on the attached photocopy of the drawings together with a letter to the Chief Draftsperson. Subject to the Examiner's approval and a Notice of Allowance, suitably corrected substitute formal drawings will be timely filed. These new drawings will also obviate the formal objections made on Form PTO-948.

Accordingly, all formal grounds of objection/rejection are now believed to have been overcome.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by Gramlich '025 is respectfully traversed. Similarly, the parallel rejection of claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being "obvious" based on the same single Gramlich '025 reference is also respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's comments reveal that he is equating the annotation process of Gramlich with the applicant's transformation of given data from a first encoding format to a second encoding format. Such transformations of given data from one encoding format to another encoding format are <u>not</u> at all analogous to the Gramlich process where a proxy server adds substantive data content to input data (i.e., it "annotates"). Gramlich does not

at all concern itself with transforming a given collection of data from one encoding format to another encoding format.

Gramlich teaches a method of adding one or more annotation overlays to a document stored on a Web server (see Figures 4 and 5 in particular), with the annotation overlays also being stored on a Web server (although not necessarily the same Web server as that which stores the document. This allows a user to see a document, along with the comments of other users, even though the documents and the associated comments are not stored together. The document and the various annotations are loaded from their respective servers and combined by an annotation overlay proxy in response to a web browser wishing to see the document with the overlays. The annotated document is then served to the web browser by the annotation overlay proxy.

Thus it is clear that the annotation overlay proxy acts to alter the content of the requested document, i.e., by adding the contents of the various annotation overlays to the requested document. This is in distinction to applicant's claim 1 which recites that the second server computer transforms the data from a first encoding format to a second encoding format, i.e., that the content of the data remains unchanged while the encoding format used to deliver the data is changed as appropriate. Gramlich teaches away from the present invention as claimed in claim 1 by teaching that annotation overlays are added as HTML-formatted content to HTML documents so that the annotations are "seamlessly integrated" within the document (see column 6, lines 6-24).

In contrast, see the applicant's experiment described at pages 10-12 of the

specification where an audio data resource is transcoded from the PCM encoding format

to the ADPCM encoding format before being streamed to the user. The advantage of this

is that an ADPCM stream uses 50% of the bandwidth of a PCM stream (due to increased

compression) and thus the user will download the audio data resource more quickly. By

necessity, the content of the audio data resource must remain unchanged otherwise the

user will not be receiving the song that they chose to download.

It is clear from the above that Gramlich does not anticipate or suggest claims 1, 6

or 11. Gramlich only addresses the issue of modifying the content of documents while

leaving their encoding format unchanged.

Accordingly, this entire application is now believed to be in allowable condition

and a formal Notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

LSN:vc

1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor

Arlington, VA 22201-4714

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100